UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,915	10/12/2004	Modesto M. Pesavento	213201.00226	7316
	7590 01/26/200 CHIN ROSENMAN LI	EXAMINER		
(C/O PATENT ADMINISTRATOR)			DAVIS, ROBERT B	
2900 K STREET NW, SUITE 200 WASHINGTON, DC 20007-5118			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1791	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/26/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/510,915	PESAVENTO, MODESTO M.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Robert B. Davis	1791			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 Not</u> 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 34-65 and 67-76 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) 34-43, 60-65, 67-69, 70/65, 70/67-70/6) Claim(s) 44-50, 52, 57, 58, 70/44-70/50, 70/52, 7) Claim(s) 51, 53-56, 59, 70/51, 70/53-70/56 and 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction in	vn from consideration. 69 and 71-76 is/are allowed. 70/57 and 70/58 is/are rejected. 70/59 is/are objected to. relection requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	Examiner. e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

Art Unit: 1791

Response to Amendment

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In *re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 44-47 and 50 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 12-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,951,453. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the major difference between claim 44 of the instant application and claim 14 of the Patent is the intended use language that "the insert cavity is configured to substantially correspond to the length of an external portion of the preform received therein". Clearly, the porous insert of claim 14 of the Patent is capable of deforming and cooling a preform that is the same length as the mold cavity.

Art Unit: 1791

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 44-50, 52, 57, 58, 70/44-70/50, 70/52, 70/57 and 70/58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Farrell (4,034,036: figures 1-5; column 2, lines 6-13 and 38-51; and column 3, lines 1-35).
- 5. Farrell teaches a mold for reshaping an injection molded preform (12), the mold comprising: sintered metal porous inserts (14a, 14b) that corresponds to the length of the preform (12). The sintered metal insert is of a foraminous structure, wherein the pores of foramina are sufficiently small so as to prevent thermoplastic material from entering and clogging the pores, but permit the passage of air or other fluids particularly gases therethrough. The mold includes a vacuum passage (26) that serves to draw vacuum through the pores of the porous inserts (14a, 14b). The neck molds (20a, 20b) serve as a seal. The language that "the insert having a surface defining a cavity that is configured to substantially correspond to the length of an external portion of the preform received therein" is intended use. The mold of Farrell is capable of reshaping a preform having a length that substantially corresponds to the length of the cavity of the porous insert.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 34-43, 60-65, 67-69, 70/65, 70/67-70/69 and 71-76 are allowed.

Art Unit: 1791

7. Claims 51, 53-56, 59, 70/51, 70/53-70/56 and 70/59 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 44-50, 52, 57, 58, 70/44-70/50, 70/52, 70/57 and 70/58 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert B. Davis whose telephone number is 571-272-1129. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta can be reached on 571-272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1791

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert B. Davis/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791 1/21/09